



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_25142
Title of the Manuscript:	International Trade Structure Change and determinants in Laos, 2000-2014
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I consider the manuscript to be interesting, relevant and adequate for the journal. On the other hand, there are two major issues which should be addressed by the authors when resubmitting the manuscript for publication: 1. In certain parts of the literature review, the originals are followed too closely. For example, the manuscript says [lines 47-50]: "Kouparitsas (2006) undertook an exhaustive search for robust determinants of international trade, pointing out that robust variables include a measure of the scale of factor endowments, fixed exchange rates, the level of development and current account restrictions.", whereas the original – which, by the way is Baxter & Kouparitsas – says: "This paper undertakes an exhaustive search for robust determinants of international trade [...] We find that robust variables include a measure of the scale of factor endowments; fixed exchange rates; the level of development; and current account restrictions." See http://people.bu.edu/mbaxter/papers/tradedeterminants.pdf For another example, the manuscript says [lines 50-53]: "Results showed a positive and significant influence of cultural flows on overall trade, suggesting that regulations fostering domestic cultural creation might have impacts going beyond what is generally expected.", whereas the original – which, by the way is Disdier et al. – says: "Our estimations show a positive and significant influence of cultural flows on overall	1. I added, revised, deleted and rearranged some literatures according to your comments, see high light lines 49-121. 2. Actually, I used hausman test to test whether fixed or random effects is appropriate, the results showed fixed effects model should be chosen, but I forgot to write it down in the manuscript. Now, I have added relevant contents, see high light lines 394-399, 448-453. Moreover, I added explanation about panel data regression analysis, see high light lines 279-313



SDI Review Form 1.6

	trade, suggesting that regulations fostering domestic cultural creation might have impacts going beyond what is generally expected. See https://ideas.repec.org/p/spo/wpmain/infohdl2441-c8dmi8nm4pdjkuc9g8o0n71o2.html 2. The authors use econometric methods to estimate a model with panel data. However, nothing is mentioned about the method used, i.e. GLS or ML with fixed effects or random effects. This is obviously a flaw from a methodological point of view.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		